



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,222	06/01/2001	Eric W. Davison	206870	3995

22971 7590 05/23/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ATTN: PATENT GROUP DOCKETING DEPARTMENT
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER

SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/872,222

Applicant(s)

DAVISON ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad A. Siddiqi

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/28/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-6, and 8-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Czerwinski et al. (An architecture for a Secure Service Discovery Services, ACM, 1999) (hereinafter Czerwinski).
4. As per claim 1, Czerwinski discloses a method for an object-exchange client to discover an accessible object-exchange resource on a network incorporating routable communications protocols, the method comprising:
listening on a multicast channel (page 26 -27, section 3.1, sds servers) provided according to a routable network communications protocol

for an object-exchange resource (page 32, 6.3, JINI) identification advertisement (page 26 -27, section 3.1, sds servers);

receiving at least one advertisement (page 32, section 6.2, condor Classads) on the multicast channel identifying an accessible object-exchange resource (page 26, section 3.1, sds servers);

storing information (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI) from the received advertisement (page 24, section 1, introduction); and using the stored information (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI) to access the identified object-exchange resource (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI).

5. As per claim 2, Czerwinski discloses the multicast channel is carried on a well-known port provided according to the routable network communications protocol protocol (well known port is inherent in the context of listening because application listens on open port, page 26 -27, section 3.1, sds servers and page 25, section 2.3, XML service description).

6. As per claim 3, Czerwinski discloses the received object-exchange resource identification advertisement is carried according to a protocol in the set consisting of: the Simple Service Discovery Protocol (page 24, Abstract) and the Service Location Protocol (page 33, section 6.4, SLP).

7. As per claim 4, Czerwinski discloses the received object-exchange resource identification advertisement contains information expressed according to an extensible markup language definition (page 25, section 2.3, XML service description).

5. As per claim 5, Czerwinski discloses an object-exchange server, an object-exchange service (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI), and a second object-exchange client (fig 1, page 25-26, section 2.4, Privacy and Authentication).

8. As per claim 6, Czerwinski discloses the identified accessible object-exchange resource is an object-exchange server and the received object-exchange resource identification advertisement lists object-exchange services (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI) provided by the object-exchange server (fig 1, page 25-26, section 2.4, Privacy and Authentication).

9. As per claim 8, Czerwinski discloses applying a filter to the at least one received advertisement and discarding advertisements that do not satisfy criteria of the filter (page 29-30, section 4.2, Description Aggregation and query Routing).

10. As per claim 9, Czerwinski discloses at least one criterion of the filter is in the group: Globally Unique Identifier, geographical location, network hop count from the identified (page 32, section 6.1, DNS and globe) accessible object-exchange resource to the object-exchange client (2, fig 1, page 26), address mask (page 28-29, section 3.6, bootstrapping), and domain name (page 29, section 4.1, Adaptive Server Hierarchy Management).

11. As per claim 10, Czerwinski discloses making a list of the identified accessible object-exchange resources (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI).

12. As per claim 11, Czerwinski discloses formulating a discovery request asking object-exchange resources to identify themselves (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI); and sending the discovery request over the multicast channel (page 26 -27, section 3.1, sds servers).

13. As per claim 12, Czerwinski discloses the discovery request specifies a property (page 29-30, section 4.2, Description Aggregation and query Routing) desired in responsive object-exchange resources (page 32-33, 6.3, JINI).

14. As per claim 13, Czerwinski discloses the desired property is expressed according to an extensible markup language definition (page 25, section 2.3, XML service description).

15. As per claim 14, Czerwinski discloses the scope of dispersal of the discovery request is expanded by bridging the discovery request from one network to another network (page 33, section 6.4, SLP).

16. As per claim 15, Czerwinski discloses the scope of dispersal of the discovery request is limited by means of a network hop count (page 29, section 4.1, Adaptive Server Hierarchy Management).

17. As per claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

18. As per claim 17, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

19. As per claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 2, above.

19. As per claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 3, above.

20. As per claim 20, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 4, above.

21. As per claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 5, above.

22. As per claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 6, above.

23. As per claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 7, above.

24. As per claim 24, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 11, above.

25. As per claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Czerwinski et al. (An architecture for a Secure Service Discovery Services, ACM, 1999) (hereinafter Czerwinski) in view of Megowan et al. (Object Exchange Protocol by Pat Megowan, version 1.2, January 1999) (hereinafter Megowan).

7. As per claim 7, Czerwinski disclose synchronization service (page 28, section 3.6, bootstrapping). Czerwinski fails to disclose inbox service, file browser. However Megowan discloses inbox service, file browser (page 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Czerwinski with Megowan. The motivation would have been to have a system build on object exchange framework to ensure interoperability between devices using OBEX.

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-25 is maintained.

23. In the remarks applicants argued that:

A. Czerwinski does not disclose the restriction of claim 1 to OBEX devices and protocol.

B. Czerwinski does not discuss object-exchange model, especially advertising object-exchange resources over a routable network.

24. In response to applicant's argument A, that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "OBEX devices and protocol") are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

25. In response to applicant's argument B, Czerwinski sending the advertisement on a multicast (page 26, section 3.1, sds servers)

advertisement on a multicast channel (page 26, section 3.1, sds servers, each server is responsible for sending list of the domains) provided to a routable network (page 29, section 4, wide-Area support) communication protocol (multicast, page 32, section 6.2, condor Classads and page 26, section 3.1, sds servers).

Conclusion

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A. Siddiqi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

 **JOHN FOLLANSBEE**
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100